

look at standards of jails at all. There is no one on that board presently I believe that is in that neutral position who would bring some influence to bear upon that board to indeed carry out the intent of this bill. We are talking about rules and regulations of minimum standards and I can see a board put together that only would give it lip service. Why should we not have a district judge on that board? He can be the most objective person that you could place there in terms as he views the quality and standards of our jails in this state and I think most of you must admit we probably have some jails that look as bad as the old Calcutta days and I think it is time, if we are really going to put before the people an issue of minimal jail standards, then there should be provisions in there that they are indeed going to be honest, candid regulations that cause certain people to bring their jails up to at least a livable standard. Each human being is entitled to that much. I would oppose Senator Barnett's amendment.

PRESIDENT: Senator Dworak.

SENATOR DWORAK: Mr. President, colleagues, I gave most of my discussion on the Maresch amendment but I support the distinguished Senator from Ralston in his opposition to Senator Barnett's amendment. I think that it is a, I think we need to keep the district judges on for two reasons. I think they have the expertise, number one. Number two, I think they are very involved in these jails because they sentence people in there, and actually there is a third reason. I see them as more of a neutral, them in more of a neutral position than an advocate position. I think this gives us a better balance on this board. I think the Director of Corrections is directly involved in jails right now as an advisor. I think that anybody building a jail would automatically seek the Director of Corrections' advice. I would have preferred to have the district judges and the Director of Corrections in but that was not the wish of the distinguished body. Therefore, now the issue is, do we keep the district judges in or not, and I think we should.

PRESIDENT: Senator Nichol.

SENATOR NICHOL: Mr. Chairman, members of the body, I would oppose the Senator Barnett amendment for the reason that this has been gone over several times. Now the Director of Correctional Services is the one who provides the information for the committee, and as that, they should not be a member of the committee but furnish information. This was part of the reason for the upheaval to start with was that the Director of Correctional Services was saving to the counties, this is what you should do and they bowed their neck. Now this is a compromise and the Department of Correctional Service has offered their services to the committee which is in the role they should be playing, not a member of the committee. So I urge you to oppose the Barnett amendment.

PRESIDENT: Senator Barnett, would you want to close debate on your amendment. Senator Fowler.

SENATOR FOWLER: I guess I have been talking with Senator Dworak and I don't think his objection is adding the Director